



## Report to the Legislature Concerning Out of Home Placement Deviations

December, 2006

**Colorado State Judicial Department**

**Basis of the Report:** C.R.S. §§ 19-2-907(5)(a), 19-3-508(5)(b), and 19-3-701(6) require individual districts to report when a judge deviates from the recommendations of social services in a dependency and neglect or a delinquency case. These deviations are to be reported to the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, who in turn is to report to the Joint Budget Committee and the Health, Environment, Welfare, and Institutions Committees of both the Senate and the House.

## **I. Introduction**

The issue of out of home placement deviations discussed in this report occur when a judge or magistrate does not agree with the placement recommendation of the county department of human services (“the Department”) and orders a different placement than the one advocated by the Department. This is informally called a deviation. Judicial officers (i.e. judges and magistrates) are required to report deviations to the Joint Budget Committee and the HEWI committees from both the Senate and House.<sup>1</sup> The State Court Administrator’s Office, at the direction of the Chief Justice, is given the responsibility to file this report. In the past, the legislature and county commissioners have shown interest in the number of times that judges disagree with the original recommendation of local social services agencies. In addition, they have asked that the Judicial Department track deviations and any resulting cost or savings that accrue.

## **II. Overview of the State**

Judicial officers, social workers, and all county attorneys are bound to do what is in the best interests of the child. Judicial officers as a whole are beholden to this tenet, and can not primarily consider what will save money. Instead they consider what will best help the child in each case. Judicial officers are many times presented with differing opinions as to what is in the best interests of the child. Although the Department’s recommendations are to be accorded “great weight”<sup>2</sup> in making these decisions, the judicial officer is not bound to follow the Department’s suggestions.<sup>3</sup> If the court were bound by the Department’s recommendations, the

---

<sup>1</sup> The Senate’s Committee is called the Health, Environment, Children & Families Committee. However, the statutes still reference the HEWI committees from both the Senate and House. For the sake of statutory conformity, HEWI will be referred to as meaning both committees from the House and Senate.

<sup>2</sup> See C.R.S. § 19-2-907(5)(b)

<sup>3</sup> The Colorado Court of Appeals has held that “the recommendations of the social workers are not binding on the court...” *In the Interest of R.J.A.*, 38 Colo. App. (1976). Each court carefully weighs the recommendations of the department to determine if it is in the child’s best interests.

Court would not be serving as an oversight to the Department. That is not consistent with the system of checks and balances we have in Colorado and around the United States. In those districts where there are a number of deviations, the court was presented with differing opinions as to what was in the best interests of the child. Knowledgeable people can disagree as to the most appropriate treatment for the child, and it is up to the court to determine what is in the best interests of the child.

Nine (9) jurisdictions in Colorado reported a total of twenty-five (25) placement deviations from the recommendations of their Department during the current reporting period from July 2005 through June 2006 (Attachment A). It is assumed in this report, and indeed confirmed by the judges in the judicial districts, that if there is no report from their district, there have been no deviations. One judicial officer commented that, “in 8 ½ years I have done an override maybe three or four times.” Although this report does include deviations which save the department money, several judicial officers also responded that they do not report a deviation unless it costs the Department money. Therefore, it is reasonable to conclude that in some instances deviations saving the Department money have not been reported.

### **III. Calculating the Cost of Placement Deviations**

An important point worth noting when discussing the cost associated with the twenty-five (25) placement deviations reported statewide is that the true cost of the placement recommendation and the true cost of the deviation are rarely provided to the court by the Department at the time of hearing. This dynamic makes it untenable for the Judicial Department to report the true cost differential between a placement recommendation and a placement order. Efforts to calculate the true cost of each deviation would at best result in marginal estimates.

Contained below is an example of a typical deviation report that is based on estimated cost as opposed to the true cost.

“The county department recommended that the child be committed to The Division of Youth Corrections. The Court adopted the recommendations of the child’s guardian *ad litem*, therapist, and family by ordering her placement in the only residential treatment center presented as appropriate at the hearing. The Division of Youth Corrections website only disclosed the Fiscal Year 04 cost of the commitment, which was \$183.47 a day. It is estimated that the present cost of a Division of Youth Corrections commitment is approximately \$5,800.00 a month. In this case the cost of the residential treatment center was estimated by the county department to be \$6,802.76 a month. This placement deviation is estimated to cost the public approximately \$1,000.00 a month.”

Due to the disparity of information contained in the deviations reported to the Colorado Supreme Court, this report does not attempt to calculate the true cost associated with placement deviations for fears that the information would not be reliable or accurate. However, the report does accurately depict the location and number of deviations reported from July 2005 through June 2006.

#### **IV. Conclusion**

It is hoped that this report can continue to help facilitate discussion between the Judicial Department, the Colorado Department of Human Services, local departments, and individual judicial districts. A more comprehensive look at the issue still needs to be undertaken; one in which local departments collaborate with their districts to obtain accurate figures as to deviations and their true costs. Local department directors and supervisors should work with judicial officers in the individual districts to develop procedures that ensure adequate reporting of the cost of deviations. Judicial districts are unable to report on the cost of placements when they are not provided with accurate financial information.

In conclusion, all parties need to be mindful that the child's best interests should be protected and evaluated in all of these placement decisions. The judge, as ultimate arbiter of the child's best interests, needs to be mindful of different placements and is ultimately responsible for ensuring the child receives an appropriate and safe temporary residence.

**Attachment A: Statewide Deviation Table**

<b>Judicial District/County</b>	<b>Number of Deviations Report by County</b>
<b>First Judicial District (Jefferson and Gilpin Counties)</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Second Judicial District (Denver County)</b>	<b>2 (Denver County)</b>
<b>Third Judicial District (Las Animas and Huerfano Counties)</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Fourth Judicial District (El Paso and Teller Counties)</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Fifth Judicial District (Eagle, Summit, Lake and Clear Creek Counties)</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Sixth Judicial District (La Plata and Archuleta Counties)</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Seventh Judicial District (Delta, Gunnison, Montrose, Ouray, San Miguel and Hinsdale Counties)</b>	<b>1 (Montrose County)</b>
<b>Eight Judicial District (Larimer and Jackson Counties)</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Ninth Judicial District (Rio Blanco, Garfield and Pitkin Counties)</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Tenth Judicial District (Pueblo County)</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Eleventh Judicial District (Park, Chaffee, Fremont and Custer Counties)</b>	<b>4 (Fremont County)</b>
<b>Twelfth Judicial District (Saguache, Mineral, Rio Grande, Alamosa, Conejos and Costilla Counties)</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Thirteenth Judicial District (Sedgwick, Phillips, Logan, Morgan, Washington, Yuma and Kit Carson Counties)</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Fourteenth Judicial District (Moffat, Routt and Grand Counties)</b>	<b>1 (Moffat County)</b>
<b>Fifteenth Judicial District (Cheyenne, Kiowa, Prowers and Baca Counties)</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Sixteenth Judicial District (Otero, Bent and Crowley Counties)</b>	<b>2 (Otero County) 1 (Bent County)</b>
<b>Seventeenth Judicial District (Adams and Broomfield Counties)</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Eighteenth Judicial District (Arapahoe, Douglas, Lincoln and Elbert Counties)</b>	<b>8 (Arapahoe County)</b>
<b>Nineteenth Judicial District (Weld County)</b>	<b>5 (Weld County)</b>
<b>Twentieth Judicial District (Boulder County)</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Twenty-First Judicial District (Mesa County)</b>	<b>2 (Mesa County)</b>
<b>Twenty-Second Judicial District (Montezuma and Dolores Counties)</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Statewide Total</b>	<b>25</b>